

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Weshington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/558,393	04/25/2000	Stephen P. Scheinberg	AD6552USNAI	9134	
30743	7590 02/05/2003				
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			EXAMINER HALPERN, MARK		
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340					
RESTON, VA	20190		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1731		
			DATE MAILED: 02/05/2003	2/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	_	09/558,393	SCHEINBERG, STEPHEN P.	,
Offic Actio	on Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Mark Halpern	1731	
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE MAILING DATE O - Extensions of time may be avaranter SIX (6) MONTHS from th - If the period for reply specified - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set of	F THIS COMMUNICATION. tilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 e mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a replied above, the maximum statutory period or extended period for reply will, by statute e later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONT! 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro to, cause the application to become ABANDO! g date of this communication, even if timely file	timely filed ays will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. VED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,
1) Responsive to c	ommunication(s) filed on 17.	<u>lanuary 2003</u> .		
2a) This action is FI		is action is non-final.		
		ance except for formal matters, Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>36,37,3</u>	9-45 is/are pending in the ap	plication.		
4a) Of the above	claim(s) 43 is/are withdrawn f	rom consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is	/are allowed.			İ
6) Claim(s) 36,37,39	9-42,44 and 45 is/are rejected	i .		
7) Claim(s) is	lare objected to.			
	re subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers				
•	s objected to by the Examine			
,		pted or b) objected to by the Ex		
,,	,	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	• •	
	-	_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.	
	cted drawings are required in re	•		
	ation is objected to by the Ex	aminer.		
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §	-	5.77 - 4. 0511.0.0.0.440	(-) (4) (6)	
,	•	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(a) or (t).	
a) All b) Some	<i>,</i> —	a la combana de actual		
	ppies of the priority document		et. At	
_	• •	s have been received in Applica		
applica	tion from the International Bu	rity documents have been receing (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not receing the certified copies not received the certified copies not receive the certified n	-	
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is	s made of a claim for domesti	ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e) (to a provisional application).	
		ovisional application has been reic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 12		i
Attachment(s)		30		
Notice of References Cited Notice of Draftsperson's Pa Information Disclosure Stat		5) Notice of Informa	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) al Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/558,393 Page 2

Art Unit: 1731

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of Amendment received 10/29/2002, Paper No. 11.
 Applicant amends claims 36, 37 and 40.

Election/Restrictions

2) Applicant's election with traverse of species of carbon, in Paper No. 14, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a variety of fibers can be used as the reinforcement fibers that can be constructed into a mat. This is not found persuasive because, as the applicant points out, there is a wide variety of species of fiber, the applicant recited 13 species of fibers, which are distinct species to be searched and considered.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

- 3) Acknowledgement is made of Response to Restriction, Paper No. 14, wherein Applicant further amends claims 36, 37 and 40, to recite the species of carbon fiber, as opposed to the species of polyacrylonitrile or pitched based carbon.
- 4) Claim 43 is removed from consideration by the examiner, since it recites the nonelected species of fibers of glass.

Claim Objections

5) Claims 44-45, are objected to because of the following informalities: claims

Art Unit: 1731

44-45, should be reconsidered since the Applicant elected the species of carbon fiber, as opposed to the species of polyacrylonitrile or pitched based carbon. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless ~

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6) Claims 36-37, 39-40, 42, 44-45, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bagg (4,016,031) in view of Fukuta (4,229,397).

Claims 36-37, 44-45: Bagg discloses a mat made of carbon fibers wherein the carbon fibers are unidirectional in at least 90 percent alignment (col. 1, lines 50-55, and col. 3, lines 5-50). This reads on the claimed fibers 9 to 1 machine to cross direction ratio, and on the claimed at least 90 percent machine direction orientation of fibers.

Bagg fails to disclose a basis weight of the mat. Fukuta discloses a mat made of

Application/Control Number: 09/558,393

wide range of basis weights in the design of Bagg.

Art Unit: 1731

reinforcing fibrous carbon fibers of basis weight from 10 gm/meter square to 1 kg/meter square (col. 1, line 46 to col. 2, line 41, and col. 4, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Bagg and Fukuta, because such a combination would provide a mat of a

Page 4

Claim 39: Fukuta discloses thermoplastic components (col. 2, lines 43-68).

Claim 40: Fukuta discloses a plurality of mats (col. 5, lines 22-27).

Claim 42: Fukuta discloses mats of different fibers and different orientations (col. 2, line 29 to col. 8, line 48).

7) Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Bagg. Bagg discloses a mat made of carbon fibers wherein the carbon fibers are unidirectional in at least 90 percent alignment (col. 1, lines 50-55, and col. 3, lines 5-50).

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claim 41, as opposed to the product taught by the reference Bagg, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

8) Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fukuta. Fukuta discloses a mat made of reinforcing fibrous carbon fibers of basis weight from 10 gm/meter square to 1 kg/meter square (col. 1, line 46 to col. 2, line 41, and col. 4, lines 46-50).

Art Unit: 1731

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claim 41, as opposed to the product taught by the reference Fukuta, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Response to Amendment

- 9) Specification cross-reference section update to indicate that the application 09/054771, is now patent US 6,066,235, is accepted.
- 10) Claim 36 objection due to informalities is withdrawn.
- 11) Claims 36-37, 39-40, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Casey, is withdrawn in view of amended claims.
- 12) Claims 41-42, rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey in view of Bagg (GB 1,389, 539) and Weeks (5,409,573), is withdrawn in view of amended claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 703-305-4522. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 703-308-1164. The fax phone numbers

Application/Control Number: 09/558,393 Page 6

Art Unit: 1731

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7718 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

Mark Halpern Patent Examiner Art Unit 1731

January 28, 2003